Appl. No. 10/562,872   Reply under 37 CFR 1.116
Final Amendment and/or Response   Expedited Procedure – TC 2444
Reply to final Office action of 4 June 2009

                                                         Page 7 of 10

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application.

The Examiner rejects claims 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. 101. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner asserts that the claimed computer readable media could be a carrier wave, transmission media, or data signal. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. Claim 9 was amended in the applicants' prior response to specifically state that the control software is stored on a computer-readable medium. The applicants respectfully maintain that a transient carrier wave, transmission media, or data signal cannot *store* software. A physical device is required to store software, and such a device is an article of manufacture. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that claims 9-12 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 101, and respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, and 13-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Weast (USP 7,454,511) and Salmonsen et al. (USPA 2003/0220781, hereinafter Salmonsen). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest a renderer-control point combination that receives a URI representative of a Content Directory Service description, as specifically claimed in independent claim 1. In like manner, the combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest a device or control software that processes a URI representative of a Content Directory Service description, as specifically claimed in independent claims 5 and 9, and fails to teach or suggest a device that receives a URI for receiving a content directory from a media server that provides a context of an item of content, as claimed in independent claim 13, and fails to teach or suggest a method that includes receiving a URI corresponding to the context of a content item, from which a subsequent content item is determined, as claimed in independent claim 22.

Appl. No. 10/562,872
Final Amendment and/or Response
Reply to final Office action of 4 June 2009

Reply under 37 CFR 1.116
Expedited Procedure – TC 2444

Page 8 of 10

The Examiner asserts that Salmonsen discloses receiving a URI representative of a Content Directory Service description at paragraph 0123, lines 1-15. This assertion is incorrect. At the cited text, Salmonsen discloses:

> "The media directory 518 is a media container, holding a list of all available media content and possibly some or all of the media content. The media directory 518 operates as a virtual media directory, enabling and facilitating access to locally-stored media content and remote media contained by other servers and devices. The media directory 518 stores Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) that identify content resources. URIs includes WWW addresses, Universal Document Identifiers, Universal Resource Identifiers, and combinations of Uniform Resource Locators (URL) and Names (URN). Uniform Resource Identifiers are formatted strings that identify a resource by name, location, or another characteristic. The media directory 518 holds URIs of all files that the server 500 can deliver for rendering. The URIs can correspond to files stored anywhere."

As taught by Salmonsen, the URIs identify the content items. The directory 518 includes a plurality of URIs representative of the content items; there is no URI in Salmonsen that is representative of the directory itself. As the Examiner acknowledges, the "media directory 518 stores Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) that identify content resources" (Office action, paragraph 9, lines 11-12). The Office action fails to identify where Salmonsen teaches a URI that is representative of the directory, as claimed by the applicants.

The applicants teach and claim enabling a control point on a renderer to use an organizational context of a content item by receiving a URI representative of the content directory service description. The combination of Weast and Salmonsen does not teach or suggest receiving a URI representation of the content directory service to enable a renderer to use the organization context of a content item, as specifically claimed in claim 1.

The applicants teach and claim control software for execution by a media renderer – control point combination to enable the media renderer to exploit an organizational context of a content item by processing a URI representative of the content directory description. The combination of Weast and Salmonsen does not teach or suggest processing a URI representation of the content directory description

Appl. No. 10/562,872
Final Amendment and/or Response
Reply to final Office action of 4 June 2009

Reply under 37 CFR 1.116
Expedited Procedure – TC 2444

Page 9 of 10

to enable a renderer to exploit the organization context of a content item, as specifically claimed in claim 9.

The applicants teach and claim receiving a content item and a URI corresponding to a context of the content item within a media server from an external controller, and determining a subsequent content item at the media server to be rendered, based on the context. The combination of Weast and Salmonsen does not teach or suggest receiving a URI corresponding to a context of a content item from an external controller, and does not teach or suggest determining a subsequent content item for rendering based on this received context, as specifically claimed in claim 22.

Because the combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach a URI that is representative of a content directory, and fails to teach a URI that is representative of the context of the content items, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, and 13-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Weast and Salmonsen is unfounded, and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejects claims 4, 8, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Weast, Salmonsen, and Saulpaugh et al. (USP 7,065,574, hereinafter Saulpaugh). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 4, 8, and 12 are dependent upon claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively, and in this rejection, the Examiner relies upon the combination of Weast and Salmonsen for teaching the elements of claims 1, 5, and 9. As noted above, the combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest a URI that is representative of a content directory, as specifically claimed in each of claims 1, 5, and 9. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 4, 8, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on the combination of Weast and Salmonsen for teaching the elements of claims 1, 5, and 9 is unfounded, and should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/562,872
Final Amendment and/or Response
Reply to final Office action of 4 June 2009

Reply under 37 CFR 1.116
Expedited Procedure – TC 2444

Page 10 of 10

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:
Yan Glickberg, Esq.
PHILIPS IP&S
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (440) 483-3455
Fax: (914) 332-0615